

REMARKS

Claims 1-9, 11-22, 24-28, 30, and 36-40 are pending. Claims 1, 14, 28, and 36 are in independent form.

In the BPAI decision mailed April 28, 2011, the rejection of claims 1, 14, 28, and 36 as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,484,161 to Chipalkatti et al. (hereinafter "Chipalkatti") was affirmed. The affirmations are based on various contentions, including the contentions that Applicant's have not defined the meaning of a "source article," that it is reasonable to consider business listings to be concepts, and that categorized document objects received by a user's browser are reasonably considered to be a source article. Further, in regard to claim 28, the "business name/category" and "address" content regions on Chipalkatti's Superpages Internet online query tool are reasonably considered to be first and second content regions of a source article on which advertisements matching concepts expressed in those regions are displayed.

As shown above, the claims have been amended to clarify various aspects of the claimed subject matter. For example, the claims have been amended to recite that determining local concepts and concepts expressed different regions includes identifying and aligning two or more words with concepts. Further, a source meaning is a vector of representative concepts expressed in the web page document.

Moreover, the order of the recited activities has been specified. In regard to claims 1 and 14, Chipalkatti does not teach or suggest eliminating the previously identified unrelated concepts from a determination of a source meaning for a source web page document. In regard to claim 36, Chipalkatti does not teach or suggest that determining a source meaning for a web page document includes excluding a previously identified first concept from the determination of the source meaning. In regard to claim 28, Chipalkatti does not teach or suggest that previously matched advertisements are caused to be on a previously received source web page document, as recited.

Accordingly, claims 1, 14, 28, and 36 are not anticipated by Chipalkatti.

Applicant : Weissman et al.
Serial No. : 10/689,903
Filed : October 21, 2003
Page : 11 of 11

Attorney's Docket No.: 16113-0329001

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue, or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue, or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Please apply any charges or credits, including the fee for the Request for Continued Examination, to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 24, 2011

/John F. Conroy, Reg. #45,485/
John F. Conroy
Reg. No. 45,485

Customer Number 26192
Fish & Richardson P.C.
Telephone: 011 49 (89) 57959 - 125
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945